

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHARLES W. TOOKER,

Plaintiff,

v.

T MAK, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [20-cv-07373-HSG](#)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART EXTENSION OF
TIME TO COMPLY WITH COURT
ORDER REQUIRING DISCOVERY
RESPONSES**

Re: Dkt. No. 41

Plaintiff, an inmate housed at Correctional Training Facility (“CTF”), has filed this *pro se* civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that defendants CTF lieutenants Mak and Deverick, and California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitations (“CDCR”) appeals coordinator Lee, denied him due process with respect to his disciplinary proceedings. Dkt. Nos. 1, 6. On March 7, 2022, the Court granted in part and denied in part Defendants’ motion to compel, and ordered Plaintiff to provide complete responses to Defendants’ Request for Admissions, Set One; to defendant Deverick’s Interrogatories Nos. 1-5, 8; and to Defendants’ Request for Production Nos. 1-3, 6, by March 21, 2022. Dkt. No. 39. The Court also reset the briefing schedule and ordered Plaintiff to file an opposition to Defendants’ summary judgment motion by April 1, 2022. Dkt. No. 39. Plaintiff has requested a sixty-day extension of time to comply with the Court’s order, alleging that Defendants’ requests and motions are “strategically superfluous” and “onerous and intimidating,” and claiming that he has only been served with a proof of service, and not the summary judgment motion itself. Dkt. No. 41. Defendants have filed an informational chrono in which the Correctional Training Facility Litigation Coordinator reports that he hand-delivered the summary judgment motion, consisting of a 237 page doubled-sided document, to Plaintiff on March 21, 2022. Dkt. No. 42.

1 Plaintiff's request for an extension of time is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN
2 PART. Dkt. No. 41.


3 Plaintiff must serve his discovery responses on Defendants by April 8, 2021. **No further**
4 **extensions of time will be granted to comply with his discovery obligations.** The Court has
5 reviewed the discovery requests and find that they ask straightforward questions that are within
6 Plaintiff's knowledge and do not require additional time to research or prepare responses. The
7 record indicates that, at the latest, Plaintiff received the summary judgment motion on March 21,
8 2022.

9 The Court GRANTS Plaintiff an extension of time to May 12, 2022, to file his opposition.
10 Defendants' reply is due within fourteen (14) days of the date the opposition is filed. Plaintiff
11 should litigate this action promptly and in good faith. Plaintiff's letters to the Court complaining
12 about Defendants, their pleadings, and prison conditions serve no legal purpose and are not
13 considered by the Court.

14 This order terminates Dkt. No. 41.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 Dated: 3/24/2022

17 
18 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
19 United States District Judge
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28